

Appln. No. 09/865,394  
Response dated Dec. 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Sep. 8, 2005  
Docket No. 6169-200

IBM Docket No. BOC9-2000-0064

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action of September 8, 2005 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-20 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,046,742 to Chari (hereinafter Chari).

Applicants have amended each of independent Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 10. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. (See, e.g., p. 17, line 11 - p. 18, line 19.)

#### **I. Applicant's Invention**

It may be helpful to reiterate certain features of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited reference. One embodiment of the invention is a node exposing method. The method includes providing, by request to a plurality of software agents, references to a plurality of nodes, wherein each node is associated with a display element displayable in a display map. Each display element corresponding to a node is capable of simultaneously displaying a plurality of attributes for its associated node. Accordingly, each display element can display attributes – represented, for example, as data metric values or other information – corresponding to each component or entity of a heterogeneous system being monitored. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 12, lines 2-5; see also p. 12, line 17 – p. 13, line 5.)

Moreover, each attribute can be alternately presented in one of a plurality of pre-selected visual formats, each visual format corresponding to a different discrete quantized value. In one embodiment, different colors correspond to different quantized values. (See p. 17, line 11 - p. 18, line 3.) In an alternative embodiment, when a value of the

IBM Docket No. BOC9-2000-0064

Appln. No. 09/865,394  
Response dated Dec. 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Sep. 8, 2005  
Docket No. 6169-200

attribute is at or near a predetermined threshold, the attribute can be made to blink intermittently on a display screen. (See, p. 18, lines 15-18.)

At least one such data metric can be received from associated components by one of the agents, according to the method, and each agent can compute at least one updated value in response to receiving the data metrics. The method also includes updating at least one of the display elements in the display map with the updated values received from the agents.

## II. The Claims Define Over Chari

As already noted, each of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chari. Chari is directed to a method for organizing and displaying management information regarding hardware and software components in a computer-based network. (Col 6, lines 28-37; Abstract.) In contrast to Applicants' invention, Chari provides component-related information arranged as hierarchical data structures. (Col. 4, lines 42-58.) As repeatedly emphasized in the reference, Chari's display of data is a display of *hierarchical data*; that is, data whose structure is organized into "a plurality of hierarchical levels". (Col. 4, lines 45-47.) Accordingly, each component, or node, representation in Chari corresponds to multiple objects, each having a particular value. This difference regarding the nature of the data corresponding to system nodes results in major differences between Chari and Applicants' invention, both with respect to the way data is represented and the way it is displayed.

Chari does not expressly or inherently teach, for example, representing a node as a single object with multiple attributes (e.g., metric data) bound to the single object displayed. Nor does Chari teach, expressly or inherently, visually presenting attributes alternately in one of a plurality of pre-selected visual formats, each visual format corresponding to a different discrete quantized value.

Appln. No. 09/865,394  
Response dated Dec. 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Sep. 8, 2005  
Docket No. 6169-200

IBM Docket No. BOC9-2000-0064

It follows that Chari does not expressly or inherently teach each of the features recited in independent Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 10. Applicants respectfully assert, therefore, that the prior art fails to anticipate any of the amended independent claims. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that, because each of the remaining claims depends from one of these independent claims while reciting additional features, the remaining claims likewise are not anticipated by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-20 be withdrawn

### CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2005



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577  
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652  
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164  
AKERMAN SENTERFITT  
Customer No. 40987  
Post Office Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188.  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000